

SABRINA RAPHAELA BUEBL
Università degli Studi di Salerno and Universität Wien

DEFINING A DISCIPLINE: KUNSTGESCHICHTLICHE ANZEIGEN AS A CRITICAL ORGAN FOR THE VIENNA SCHOOL*

While the journal *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* (KA) has often been mentioned in obituaries or biographical overviews of Franz Wickhoff and Max Dvořák as one of their numerous projects,¹ little has been noted about its founding, content, and objectives. The aim of this article is to make the first synthetic presentation of this scholarly project, which served as a critical organ for the judgement of art-historical publications by the members of the Vienna School of Art History. It will be conducted on the basis of the personal correspondence between Wickhoff and Dvořák,² in which the founding of the KA is discussed, as well as by highlighting some of the main values propagated

by the protagonists of the Vienna School, in order to establish a more precise definition of the idea of *Wissenschaftlichkeit* ('scientificity') of art history, as demanded by the editors. Finally, a reflection on the journal's effectiveness and legitimacy in the broader context of the institutionalisation of the discipline of art history will be considered.

THE PROJECT

In a letter written on 9 January 1904 to his teacher Franz Wickhoff, Max Dvořák stated:

I think that your concerns that we want to judge but have not published any major works recently are not justified. Firstly, this is not the case with you, for if anyone's work gives one the right to pass judgement on scientific questions in art history, it is you, and no one else, for no one in Germany has done as much for the scientificity of art history as you have. Secondly, in my opinion, it is not at all necessary for a reviewer to acquire the legal title for his profession through his own great works, just as a reviewer in fine literature does not have to be a poet himself. It is sufficient if he has methodical training and is competent in relation to the book under discussion. I am convinced, by the way, that once the matter is set in motion, it will run by itself and become the real scientific centre.³

* This article is the result of a talk at the conference *Art History and its Institutions in the Austro-Hungarian Empire*, organised by the Institute of Art History of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow on 28–29 September 2023. I would like to thank Wojciech Bałus, Tomáš Murár and Matthew Rampley for their valuable observations, which have enhanced this publication.

¹ See, for example, V. KRAMÁŘ, 'Franz Wickhoff', *Volné směry*, 1909, 13, pp. 211–214; D. FREY, *Max Dvořák zum Gedächtnis. Max Dvořáks Stellung in der Kunstgeschichte*, Vienna 1922, p. 10; J. WEINGARTNER, 'Max Dvořák und die kunsthistorische Wiener Schule', *Hochland*, 1924, vol. 21, 1, pp. 345–351, 348; F. POLLERROSS, '170. Geburtstag von Franz Wickhoff', Institut für Kunstgeschichte, 7.05.2023, <https://kunstgeschichte.univie.ac.at/ueber-uns/mitarbeiterinnen/institutsnachrichten/170-geburtstag-von-franz-wickhoff/> (access: 25.10.2024).

² In 1903, the year before the first issue of KA was published, there was a very intensive exchange of information on editorial aspects. However, for reasons of space, it is not possible to go into all the details here. The cited letters below are from Max Dvořák to Franz Wickhoff, located in Wickhoff's estate at the archive of the Institut für Kunstgeschichte (IKG) (box 2, folder 1) at the University of Vienna.

³ 'Ich glaube[,] dass Ihre Bedenken deshalb, dass wir richten wollen und selbst keine grossen Arbeiten in der letzten Zeit publicieren[,] nicht berechtigt sind. Erstens trifft es bei Ihnen nicht zu, denn wenn Jemandem seine Arbeiten das Recht geben über wissenschaftliche Fragen in der Kunstgeschichte ein Urteil zu fällen, so sind es Sie, wie niemand zweiter, denn niemand hat in Deutschland für die Wissenschaftlichkeit der Kunstgeschichte

Dvořák referred to the activity undertaken by him and Franz Wickhoff since the final months of 1902 of founding a critical journal that could review publications in the field of art history. The project took name under the title *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*. The term *Anzeige* can mean either 'notice' or 'advertisement' but also 'report' or even 'complaint'. Clearly, it is the function of *Anzeige* as a notice that should give meaning to the title of this journal,⁴ but – sarcastically speaking – in the case of some highly critical reviews a denunciatory interpretation would also suit perfectly. The KA appeared quarterly from 1904 to 1909, with a break in 1908, as an appendix to the official organ of the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung (IÖG), the *Mittheilungen*, where Wickhoff held the chair of art history. After Wickhoff's death in April 1909, the journal continued to appear under Dvořák's editorship until 1913. In the interwar period, another journal focused on methodology appeared: *Kritische Berichte zur kunstgeschichtlichen Literatur*, published from 1927 to 1937 and edited by Rudolf Kautzsch, Wilhelm Pinder, Georg Swarzenski (who contributed seven reviews in the first three volumes of the KA) and Karl Maria Swoboda, a former student of Dvořák's. In his introductory words to the first volume of this successor, Pinder underlined the intention to ideologically continue the purpose of the KA:

Since the Viennese Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen do not exist anymore, we no longer have an organ whose sole purpose is the self-criticism of art history as a science. [...] Today, we see neither the danger recognised by Wickhoff nor that by Dvořák as having been eliminated.⁵

In its final incarnation, Karl M. Swoboda attempted to restore the magazine in 1955, editing it for seven volumes until 1965.

When the journal was founded, art history as a discipline could already look back at about fifty years of

practical experience,⁶ but it still had to struggle with contamination through lack of methodological coherency, nationalistic intentions in defining the evolution of artistic creation, and amateurish interference disguised as professional contributions. By 1902, Franz Wickhoff and Alois Riegl held the two chairs of art history at the IÖG, where an increasing number of history students dedicated their research to art history, which was in the process of liberating itself from the function of mere auxiliary science. Turning their gaze towards the more consolidated *Geschichtswissenschaft*, the art historians at the Viennese University also longed for a profound and secure method. To disseminate their vision of a methodologically stable praxis the scholars needed an official organ through which they could communicate their ideas on art-historical research, its method, and instruments as well as to separate good from bad examples. It is in this context, that Dvořák on 23 December 1902 wrote to Wickhoff:

When I was with Riegl last week, we also talked about the prevalence of dilettantism in art history and since I am convinced that the conditions in political history are better only thanks to the generally practised critical supervision of production, it occurred to me that a critical organ published in Vienna could improve many things. It was only through the bella diplomatica under Sickel that the Monumenta [Germaniae Historica] became what they are today, and in the art-historical reviews, as in the Repertorium [für Kunstwissenschaft], the papers are mostly a matter of favours. Now, a critical organ would not have to be founded in Vienna. The institutional publications could be used for this purpose. [...] It would be of great advantage if the scientific nature of the art-historical production could be strictly monitored from Vienna, where there is such a large number of suitable contributors.⁷

so viel getan wie Sie, zweitens ist es aber meines Erachtens gar nicht notwendig[,] dass sich ein Recensent durch eigene grosse Arbeiten den Rechtstitel für seinen Beruf erwirbt, ebenso wie ein Recensent in der schönen Literatur nicht selbst ein Dichter sein muss. Es genügt[,] wenn er über methodische Schulung verfügt und in dieser Beziehung dem besprochenen Buche souveränen [sic!] gegenüber steht. Ich bin übrigens überzeugt, dass die Sache[,] einmal in Gang gebracht[,] von selbst laufen wird und zum wirklichen wissenschaftlichen Centrum wird.'

⁴ Considering the use of the term on other occasions, as for the title of the influential *Götttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*.

⁵ 'Seit die Wiener Kunstgeschichtlichen Anzeigen nicht mehr bestehen, besitzen wir kein Organ, dessen ausschließlicher Zweck in der Selbstkritik der Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft gelegen wäre. [...] Wir sehen heute weder jene von Wickhoff, noch diese von Dvořák erkannte Gefahr als beseitigt an.' W. PINDER, 'Einleitende Worte', in *Kritische Berichte zur kunstgeschichtlichen Literatur*, vol. 1, ed. R. KAUTZSCH et al., Leipzig 1927, pp. 1–2.

⁶ On the institutionalisation process see W. BEYRODT, 'Kunstgeschichte als Universitätsfach', in *Kunst und Kunsttheorie 1400–1900*, ed. P. GANZ et al., Wiesbaden 1991, pp. 313–333; and B. VOM BROCKE, 'Wege aus der Krise. Universitäts-Seminar, Akademie-Kommission oder Forschungs-Institut? Institutionalisierungsbestreben in den Geistes- und Naturwissenschaften und in der Kunstgeschichte vor und nach 1900', in *Storia dell'arte e politica culturale intorno al 1900. La fondazione dell'Istituto Germanico di Storia dell'Arte di Firenze. Per i cento anni dalla fondazione del Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz. Firenze, 21–24 maggio 1997*, ed. M. SEIDL, Venice 1999, pp. 179–222.

⁷ 'Als ich vorige Woche bei Riegl gewesen bin[,] sprachen wir auch von dem Überhandnehmen des Dilettantismus in der Kunstgeschichte und da ich überzeugt bin, dass die Verhältnisse in der politischen Geschichtswissenschaft nur dank der allgemein geübten kritischen Überwachung der Production besser sind, fiel mir ein[,] dass ein in Wien erscheinendes kritisches Organ vieles bessern könnte. Erst durch die bella diplomatica unter Sickel sind die Monumenta zu dem geworden, was sie heute sind[,] und in den kunstgeschichtlichen Revuen[,] z.B. im Repertorium[,] sind die Referate zumeist Gefälligkeitssache. Nun müsste jedoch in

The main task of the publication thus becomes clear in these words: monitoring, supervision, and control of the methodical application of art-historical research are the purposes that the periodical should fulfil. Only three weeks later, on 14 January 1903, Dvořák already had the scheme of the first issue sent to his former teacher. It should contain five reviews, two by Wickhoff, two by Dvořák, and one by Wolfgang Kallab, but until they were published another year had to pass. Only in August 1903 did Dvořák nominate the KA again in a letter, asking if it wouldn't be possible to continue working on the critical supplement to the *Mittheilungen*. And, finally, on 5 September he wrote from Roudnice: 'I am very pleased that the journal is coming to life. I hope it will be good, and I will do whatever I possibly can with great pleasure.'⁸

During the following winter, in which Wickhoff had headed off on a long excursion to Greece, Turkey and Egypt, Dvořák was occupied with the organisation of the journal: choosing the reviews, writing to the individual contributors, conceptualising the typographic formatting of the articles with the university publisher Wagner in Innsbruck, making budget calculations, and so on. Due to Wickhoff's absence in this period, this process is very well documented by the correspondence between the two.

A very interesting aspect is the choice of academics they wanted to invite to contribute. Among these were not only Wickhoff's own pupils and Dvořák's direct colleagues from Vienna, such as the above mentioned Kallab, Hans Tietze, Gustav Glück and Friedrich Dörnhöffer (to mention just a few of the first contributors) but also the German art historians Georg Swarzenski and Adolph Goldschmidt, who were both positively reviewed in the first issue and contributed to the first volume. But still, until 1909 most reviews were written by Wickhoff himself, who contributed 42 times, followed by his assistant Tietze with 22 and Dvořák with 19 reviews. Out of the 27 writers in total, the majority can be counted as pupils of the Vienna School, while only seven contributors came from other universities. Besides Goldschmidt and Swarzenski, there were Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, Raymond Koechlin, Friedrich Rintelen, Frida Schottmüller, and Wilhelm Vöge. Only Swarzenski and Rintelen contributed several reviews (respectively seven and six), while the others made only one contribution, most of them in the first three volumes. About the involvement of 'reichs-deutsche' colleagues, Dvořák wrote:

Wien ein kritisches Organ nicht erst begründet werden. Es könnten dazu die Institutionsmittheilungen verwendet werden. Es wäre von grossem Vorteil[,] wenn man von Wien aus, wo es eine so grosse Anzahl geeigneter Mitarbeiter gibt, die Wissenschaftlichkeit der kunstgeschichtlichen Production streng überwachen könnte.'

⁸ 'Es freut mich riesig, dass die Zeitung zu Stande kommt. Ich hoffe[,] sie wird gut werden, was in meinen Kräften nur steht, will ich mit grosser Freude einsetzen.'

A misunderstanding about the tendency of the journal is also excluded by the content of the other reviews and that this tendency is shared and approved by serious people is clear from the letters that Goldschmidt and Swarzenski wrote to me. We have nothing at all to do with people who do not approve of this tendency, they are the ones we must fight.⁹

His selection criteria were therefore not so much related to an academic's provenance as to his methodological approach.¹⁰

THE CONCEPT OF WISSENSCHAFTLICHKEIT

But what precisely was this tendency, this *Wissenschaftlichkeit* that was always referred to? It is well explained in the introduction written by Franz Wickhoff on the occasion of the first issue and structured as a letter *An die Leser*.¹¹ In this brief introduction, Wickhoff directly clarified which principles he and his colleagues followed, and which were to be rejected.¹² At first, he highlighted the interrelation of the group of art historians who studied at the IÖG and the fact that their shared intention, no matter how different the precise fields of study may be, was the same: to position art history among the other historical sciences by treating the subject scientifically. For that, as Wickhoff wrote, had by no means happened yet. Colleagues from the historical or linguistic fields didn't take art historians seriously and Wickhoff could not blame them because in no other discipline could such unscientific and confused writings be published or accepted as happened in art history. These circumstances made it clear that 'orientation is lacking, that no path leads through the

⁹ 'Ein Misverständnis [sic!] über die Tendenz der Zeitschrift ist auch durch den Inhalt der sonstigen Recensionen ausgeschlossen und dass diese Tendenz von ernsten Leuten geteilt und gebilligt wird, geht aus den Briefen hervor, die mir Goldschmidt und Swarzenski geschrieben haben. Leute[,] die diese Tendenz nicht billigt [sic!], mit denen haben wir überhaupt nichts zu tun, das sind eben die, die wir bekämpfen müssen.' Letter from 14 January 1903.

¹⁰ The problem lies rather in the appalled reaction of some German academics to the crude tone of the first reviews. It is plausible that some of them decided not to participate out of collegiality rather than lack of common interests. See W. VON SEIDLITZ, 'Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen. Beiblatt der Mittheilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung', *Kunstchronik: Wochenschrift für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe*, 1904, vol. 15, 21, pp. 346-347.

¹¹ F. WICKHOFF, 'An die Leser!', *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen. Beiblatt der MIÖG*, 1904, vol. 1, 1, pp. 1-2.

¹² See also I. KALAVREZOU-MAXEINER, 'Franz Wickhoff: Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft', in *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode. Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. 4.-10. September 1983*, vol. 1, eds S. KRENN, M. PIPPAL, Vienna 1984, pp. 17-22.

tangled web of art-historical literature, because there is no scholarly reporting that separates wheat from chaff.¹³ The main task of this journal was therefore to shape a pathway and to distinguish valuable books, journals, or articles from what in their eyes was rubbish, or, in Wickhoff's words, to identify publications that 'stimulate or threaten science'.¹⁴ This appears to be a noble intention, but it clearly also reinforced the scientific superiority and authority the Vienna School tried to obtain in the discipline on a global scale. The reviews were to focus on writings on medieval and modern art (thus excluding the antique and contemporary eras) and be open to art history's auxiliary sciences, too. Positive examples praised by Wickhoff were Giovanni Morelli's method of attribution and Wilhelm Bode's approach in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett.¹⁵

Summarizing the intentions pronounced in the introduction and in the letters written by Dvořák, three main aims of the journal can be pointed out:

- 1) Elevation of art history to the status of an independent and valid scientific discipline.
- 2) Formulation, to reach this goal, of a distinctive scientific method based on source study, archival research, *connoisseurship*, and understanding of the artwork in the context of historical development.
- 3) Distinction between acceptable examples worthy of imitation and poor, unscientific approaches, where personal aesthetic or nationalistic values prevail, and therefore also a judgement upon the capabilities of a researcher.

The effort to establish the art-historical discipline is part of a broader process of institutionalisation of the humanities, and particularly of history as a precursor to art history. It should be remembered here that both Wickhoff and his student Dvořák had received their training at the IÖG and always maintained a (cultural) historical connection to art history.¹⁶ Under Wickhoff, history became an auxiliary science of art history.¹⁷ The need for a system

to analyse works of art was reflected in a number of projects initiated by Wickhoff: as a fundamental methodology for the study of the graphic works in the Albertina collection¹⁸ and the miniatures in the imperial lands¹⁹, the tradition of critical interpretation of source texts brought to the University of Vienna by Rudolf Eitelberger²⁰ was combined with Giovanni Morelli's "experimental method", which formed a sort of 'palaeography of art' in the style of Theodor von Sickel.²¹ These elements, together with a comparative iconography for didactic purposes as a form of historical grammar, formed the newly established 'rule of thumb' for the art-historical analysis of artworks.²² The legacy of two of the IÖG's founding fathers, Rudolf Eitelberger²³ and Theodor von Sickel, as well as that of Moriz Thausing,²⁴ representative of the next generation, contributed fundamentally to the *Verwissenschaftlichung der Disziplin* through the application of the Morellian method²⁵ and through his insistence on

¹³ 'Orientierung [sic!] fehlt, dass kein Weg durch das Wirrsal der kunsthistorischen Literatur führt, weil eine wissenschaftliche Berichterstattung fehlt, die Spreu vom Weizen sonderte.' F. WICKHOFF, 'An die Leser!', p. 1 (as in note 12).

¹⁴ 'Wissenschaft fördern oder auch bedrohen.' Ibidem.

¹⁵ See also Gombrich's translation of the introductory words as printed in Richard Woodfield's selection of his writings (E. H. GOMBRICH, 'On Art and Artists (*The Story of Art*)', in *The Essential Gombrich. Selected Writings on Art and Culture*, ed. R. WOODFIELD, London 1996, p. 80).

¹⁶ One may think of Köhler's famous anecdote: 'Wickhoff sagte in späteren Jahren einmal, es wäre vielleicht schade, daß Dvořák Kunsthistoriker und nicht Kulturhistoriker geworden sei.' W. KÖHLER, 'Max Dvořák', *MIÖG*, 39, 1923, pp. 314–320.

¹⁷ As Lhotsky states: 'durch Wickhoff aber ist die Historie selbst zur Hilfswissenschaft der Kunstgeschichte gemacht worden und hat ihr geben dürfen, um zu nehmen.' A. LHOTSKY, *Geschichte des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 1854–1954*, Graz 1954, p. 211.

¹⁸ F. WICKHOFF, 'Die italienischen Zeichnungen der Albertina', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 12, 1891, pp. 205–314; 13, 1892, pp. 175–283.

¹⁹ *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich*, vol. 1–3, ed. F. WICKHOFF, Leipzig 1905–1907.

²⁰ See A. DOBSLAW, *Die Wiener 'Quellenschriften' und ihr Herausgeber Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg. Kunstgeschichte und Quellenforschung im 19. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2009.

²¹ Sickel was also the founder of the *MIÖG* in 1880, in which the *KA* were published as a supplement from 1904.

²² See A. LHOTSKY, *Geschichte*, p. 231 (as in note 18).

²³ On the main characteristics of the Vienna School cultivated already by Eitelberger see his first lecture at the University of Vienna: R. EITELBERGER, 'Antrittsrede, gehalten bei Eröffnung der Vorlesungen über Theorie und Geschichte der bildenden Künste am 26. Oktober 1847', *Österreichische Blätter für Literatur, Kunst, Geschichte, Geografie, Statistik und Naturkunde*, 5, 1848, vol. 14/15, pp. 49–51 and 53–54; T. JENNI and R. ROSENBERG, 'Die Analyse der Objekte und das Studium der Quellen – Wiens Beitrag zur Etablierung einer universitären Kunstgeschichte', in *Reflexive Innensichten aus der Universität. Disziplinengeschichten zwischen Wissenschaft, Gesellschaft und Politik*, ed. K. FRÖSCHL et al., Göttingen 2015, 121–34; and *Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg. Netzwerker der Kunstwelt*, ed. E. KERNBAUER et al., Vienna 2019.

²⁴ Deeper insight into his principles can be found in Thausing's informative inaugural lecture (see M. THAUSING, 'Die Stellung der Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft. Aus einer Antrittsvorlesung an der Wiener Universität im October 1873', in idem, *Wiener Kunstbriefe*, Leipzig 1884, pp. 1–10). Rosenauer accurately emphasises his importance for the Vienna School (see A. ROSENAUER, 'Moriz Thausing und die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 1983, vol. 36, 1, pp. 135–139).

²⁵ On Giovanni Morelli in this context see: G. C. SCIOLLA, 'Il metodo morelliano e la "Scuola di Vienna" 1880–1915: una traccia di ricerca', in *Giovanni Morelli e la cultura dei conoscitori. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Bergamo, 4–7 giugno 1987*, vol. 2, ed. G. AGOSTI, Bergamo 1993, pp. 371–387; J. ANDERSON, 'Giovanni Morelli et sa définition de la "scienza dell'arte"', *Revue de l'Art*, 1987, vol. 75,

the importance of the form rather than the content of an art work, percolated through Wickhoff's teaching to the youngest historians, who were able to devote themselves directly to the study of art history. It was only a matter of time before the historical auxiliary science was given a more prominent position at the institute, as it not only trained archivists and librarians, but also museum officials (*Beamte*).²⁶

Finally, another scholar of the Vienna School must not be left unseen. Even though he was not actively involved in the KA project and did not write a single review, Alois Riegl's ideas are a driving force behind the definition of academic art history. In fact, on the occasion of Riegl's death in 1905 Dvořák wrote an obituary in which he delineated the development of the discipline of art history to date and distinguished between three different approaches since the middle of the 19th c.: cultural-historical, aesthetic and historic-dogmatic (represented respectively by Schnaase, Semper and Burckhardt).²⁷ None of these currents had been able to combine the general historic meaning with the immanent specific meaning of the single art work. Only Riegl, in Dvořák's view, had managed to bridge this gap and establish a connection between history and artwork through precise historical research. Riegl himself had reflected on this relationship in a review of Cornelius Gurlitt's 1902 *Geschichte der Kunst*, significantly entitled *Eine neue Kunstgeschichte*. In his opinion, the art-historical discipline had to follow a principle of unity that could only be realised through 'the presentation of the similarities between the artistic and other cultural endeavours – in religion, philosophy, politics, social movements – of the same time.'²⁸ This was a principle decisive for the following generation of the Vienna School.

REFLECTIONS ON THE JOURNAL'S LEGITIMACY

The format proposed by Dvořák and Wickhoff is a novelty in art history and the definition of this genre is quite specific. From today's perspective, it is easy to categorise these notices as reviews of art-historical publications, as is usual in the academic communication system. One

pp. 49–55; L. UGLOW, 'Giovanni Morelli and his Friend Giorgione: Connoisseurship, Science and Irony', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 2014, vol. 11, pp. 1–30.

²⁶ See A. LHOTSKY, *Geschichte*, pp. 205–211 (as in note 17), for the involvement of art history in the institute.

²⁷ M. DVOŘÁK, 'Alois Riegl', *Mitteilungen der k. k. Zentral-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und Historischen Denkmale*, 1905, vol. 3, 4, (col. 255–276), col. 258–259.

²⁸ 'die Darlegung der Gemeinsamkeit zwischen den künstlerischen und übrigen kulturellen Bestrebungen – in Religion, Philosophie, Politik, sozialen Bewegungen – der gleichzeitigen Zeit.' A. RIEGL, 'Eine neue Kunstgeschichte' in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. K. M. SWOBODA, Augsburg 1929, pp. 43–50.

hundred and twenty years ago, however, the situation was completely different: although literary criticism had existed since the Enlightenment and art criticism had established itself at the latest with Denis Diderot's Salon commentaries,²⁹ the reviews belong to neither the first nor the second category. They refer to writings, but only to art-historical non-fiction, and although these texts may contain observations on individual works of art, these are not the purpose of the publication, the essence of which is rather to analyse the various methods used to examine a certain topic. While individual art-historical reviews had been published before, the journal, which is limited exclusively to this format, represents a first for the entire discipline. Indeed, in the register of his comprehensive work *Kunstgeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft* from 1923, Walter Timmling described the KA as: 'Review organ only. Leading as such, not replaced to date.'³⁰ Like its precursors in the field of historical studies, this new phenomenon is a clear product of the development of disciplinary tradition over the second half of the 19th and the first quarter of the 20th c.³¹

According to the German historical information medium *H-Soz-Kult*, a modern review ideally fulfils three functions: 'It provides information about new publications and content, it subjects publications to critical quality control by professional and independent reviewers and it places the research results in a wider context.'³² If these criteria are compared with the conditions of the KA, then the first and last points apply, but what distinguishes them from today's review system is the independence of the authors. The contributors were closely linked not only by a professional but frequently also a social network and thus often pursued similar ideals.³³ In an interesting article on the role of journals in the institutionalisation process of historical scholarship, Matthias Middell refers to

²⁹ See W. MÜLLER-JENTSCH, 'Kunstkritik als literarische Gattung. Gesellschaftliche Bedingungen ihrer Entstehung, Entfaltung und Krise', *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 2012, vol. 22, pp. 539–568.

³⁰ 'Nur Rezensionsorgan. Als solches führend, bis heute nicht ersetzt.' W. TIMMLING, *Kunstgeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft*, Leipzig 1923, p. 272.

³¹ See Ch. OTTNER, 'The Professionalization of the Historical Discipline: Austrian Scholarly Periodicals, 1840–1900', in *The Making of the Humanities. The Modern Humanities*, vol. 3, ed. R. BOD, J. MAAT, T. WESTSTEIJN, Amsterdam 2014, pp. 157–169.

³² 'es informiert über neue Publikationen und Inhalte, es unterzieht Publikationen einer kritischen Qualitätskontrolle durch fachlich ausgewiesene und unabhängige Rezensent:innen und es ordnet vorgelegte Forschungsergebnisse in größere Zusammenhänge ein.' 'Forum: Buchrezensionen in den Geschichtswissenschaften', *H-Soz-Kult*, 1.01.2021, hsozkult.de/debate/id/fddebate-132428 (access: 25.10.2024).

³³ On the co-dependence of academic relationships see J. TOLLEBEEK, 'A Domestic Culture: The Mise-en-scène of Modern Historiography', in *The Making of the Humanities*, pp. 129–143 (as in note 31).

journals 'as the collective works of a group of authors'³⁴, which made the following contribution to institutionalisation:

- 1) Stabilisation of a communication framework between researchers;
- 2) Establishment of solid rules;
- 3) Academic socialisation of the individual research process and the resulting establishment of representativeness (in the sense of either a national historiography or a separation of the professional from the amateur sector).³⁵

Although the author refers to the discipline of history in his study, his observation can be applied effectively to the situation of the KA in the context of the art-historical discipline and to the desire of their editors. It was noted at the beginning that there are no further studies on the KA and generally little research on art history journals.³⁶ In my opinion, however, this deficiency can in no way be linked to the wealth of information and facets that these journals offer. It would therefore be desirable to give more consideration not only to the case studies of individual KA reviews within the system of the Vienna School,³⁷ but also to art-historical journals in general as an important channel of communication within the historical establishment of the discipline.

In his comprehensive history of the IÖG, Alphons Lhotsky noted that the KA 'have fulfilled their purpose for a decade through their ruthless fight against dilettantism'³⁸ and that due to stricter saving measures, the journal was suspended in 1914. From the missing continuation during Dvořák's lifetime, he concluded that after the end of the war no importance was given to it and that at the latest when Schlosser took over the chair in 1922, after

Dvořák's death, any thought of it had died out anyway. In conclusion, I would like to correct this observation, because Dvořák's estate in the archives of the Vienna IKG contains a draft concept for a new KA programme from 1920. As its 'Bescheidenes Programm' (humble program), Dvořák calls for 'not natural scientific experimental psychology, but historically descriptive psychology, not some skeleton of a system that fragments phenomena, but the totality of historical moments. In sum: a historical experience [*Erlebnis*] but an objectified experience at the same time.'³⁹ The notes suggest an avant-garde manifesto, written in an almost feverish tone, rather than a factual introduction to a specialised journal. Evidently, Dvořák felt that Riegl's legacy had not yet penetrated the principles of art history, even more than fifteen years after his death, otherwise he would not have felt the need to define his programme with his teacher's values. Perhaps Lhotsky's observation is not so untrue, as there was no real continuation of Wickhoff's sober programme addressed to the readers in 1904.

³⁴ 'Kollektive Werke einer Gruppe von Autoren.' M. MIDDELL, 'Vom allgemeinhistorischen Journal zur spezialisierten Liste im H-Net. Gedanken zur Geschichte der Zeitschriften als Elemente der Institutionalisierung moderner Geschichtswissenschaft', in *Historische Zeitschriften im internationalen Vergleich*, ed. idem, Leipzig 1999, p. 11.

³⁵ See *ibidem*, pp. 8-9.

³⁶ Noteworthy in this context is S. TRÖGER's *Kunstpöplarisierung und Kunstwissenschaft. Die Wiener Kunstzeitschrift »Die Graphischen Künste« (1879-1933)*, Berlin 2011, which tries in part to investigate the connection between the analysed journal and the Vienna School. Another interesting volume is M. RENNHOFFER, *Die Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich 1895-1914*, Augsburg 1997, but it is rather peripheral to the present discourse as it concentrates on art journals.

³⁷ I am currently working on an article that will take a closer look at selected reviews in the journal. On this occasion, I would like to thank Richard Woodfield for his keen interest and his motivational advises.

³⁸ 'haben ein Jahrzehnt lang durch ihre rücksichtslose Bekämpfung des Dilettantismus ihren Zweck erfüllt.' See A. LHOTSKY, *Geschichte*, p. 341 (as in note 17).

³⁹ 'Nicht irgendein Gerippe eines die Entwicklungen zerstückelnden Systems, sondern die Totalität der historischen Momente. In Summa: ein historisches Erlebnis[,] aber ein objektiviertes Erlebnis zugleich.' Estate Dvořák, box 14, IKG, University of Vienna.

SUMMARY

Sabrina Raphaela Buebl

DEFINING A DISCIPLINE: *KUNSTGESCHICHTLICHE ANZEIGEN* AS A CRITICAL ORGAN FOR THE VIENNA SCHOOL

This article briefly presents the often mentioned, yet not deeper investigated journal *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* (KA), founded by Franz Wickhoff in 1904. The primary driving force behind the project was his then assistant Max Dvořák, who continued the editorship after Wickhoff's death in 1909 until 1913. On this occasion, the founding of the journal through the unpublished correspondence between the two, which gives insight into the journal's objectives and purpose, is retraced. Particular attention is given to the involvement of scholars from other universities as well as to the KA's aim to establish a definition of scientifically valid research in art history. In this context, an analysis of the Vienna School's definition of *Wissenschaftlichkeit* ('scientificity') is a central part of the article. Finally, the author reflects on the journal's legitimacy in the broader context of the institutionalisation of the discipline of art history.